UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,067	09/30/2003	Barbara Jean Lagno	630-041US	7512

47912 7590 06/30/2005

DEMONT & BREYER, LLC
SUITE 250
100 COMMONS WAY
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER	
DESIR, PIERRE LOUIS	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2681	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,067	LAGNO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pierre-Louis Desir	2681	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *Feb. 02, 2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7 and 17 recite the limitation "the coordinates" in the first line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note: for the process of examination, "the coordinates" will be interpreted as "information."

Claim 18 recites the limitation "said first wireless terminal" in lines 3-4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note: for the process of examination, "said first wireless terminal" will be interpreted as "a first wireless terminal."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-11, 16-21, 25-27, 30, 32-34, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McDonnell et al. (McDonnell), U.S. Patent No. 6813499.

Regarding claim 1, McDonnell discloses a method comprising: determining that a first wireless terminal at a location can communicate with a second wireless terminal with a level of service (i.e., fig. 5 depicts the case of location determination being done in the mobile entity 20F by, for example, making Observed Time Difference (OTD) measurements with respect to signals from BTSs and calculating location using a knowledge of BTS locations. The location data is subsequently appended to a service request sent to service system in respect of a location-aware service) (see col. 5, lines 16-23); and transmitting to a third wireless terminal an indication that said third wireless terminal should be able to communicate with said second wireless terminal with said level of service at said location (i.e., depicts the case of location determination being done in the network, for example, by making Timing Advance measurements for three BTSs and using these measurements to derive location (this derivation typically being done in a unit associated with BSC). The resultant location data is passed to a location serve from where it can be made available to authorised services. As for the mobile entity 20C in FIG. 3, when the mobile entity 20G of FIG. 5 wishes to invoke a location-aware service available on service system, it sends a request including an authorisation token and its ID (possible embedded in the token) to the service system 40; the service system then uses the authorisation token to obtain the current location of the mobile entity 20G from the location server 67) (see col. 5, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 2, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 1 rejection) wherein said first wireless terminal and said third wireless terminal are different (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 6, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 1 rejection) wherein said level of service is in terms of latency (i.e., the PLMN can be provided with fixed GPS receivers that each continuously keep track of the satellites visible from the receiver and pass information in messages to local mobile entities as to where to look for these satellites and estimated signal arrival times; this enables the mobile entities to substantially reduce acquisition time for the satellites and increase accuracy of measurement) (see col. 4, lines 46-52).

Regarding claim 7, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 1 rejection) wherein information of said location is based on Global Positioning System measurements (see fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 9, McDonnell discloses a method comprising: receiving from a first wireless terminal a measurement of a characteristic of an electromagnetic signal radiated by a source, wherein said measurement is associated with a location (i.e., fig. 5 depicts the case of location determination being done in the mobile entity 20F by, for example, making Observed Time Difference (OTD) measurements with respect to signals from BTSs and calculating location using a knowledge of BTS locations. The location data is subsequently appended to a service request sent to service system in respect of a location-aware service) (see col. 5, lines 5-23); and transmitting to a second wireless terminal an indication that said second wireless terminal should be able to receive at said location said electromagnetic signal with said characteristic exceeding a threshold (i.e., depicts the case of location determination being done in the network, for example, by making Timing Advance measurements for three BTSs and using these measurements to derive location (this derivation typically being done in a unit associated with BSC). The resultant location data is passed to a location serve from where it can be made

available to authorised services. As for the mobile entity 20C in FIG. 3, when the mobile entity 20G of FIG. 5 wishes to invoke a location-aware service available on service system, it sends a request including an authorisation token and its ID (possible embedded in the token) to the service system 40; the service system then uses the authorisation token to obtain the current location of the mobile entity 20G from the location server 67) (see col. 5, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 10, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 9 rejection) wherein said first wireless terminal and said second wireless terminal are different (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 11, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 9 rejection) wherein said electromagnetic signal conveys a data block (i.e., the location determination is done by the infrastructure, it may be practical for systems covering only a limited number of users (such as the system illustrated in the left-hand half of FIG. 2 where a number of infrared beacons will cover a generally fairly limited) for location-data collection to be done whenever a mobile entity is newly detected by an IRB, this data being passed to location server where it is cached for use when needed) (see col.5, 44-51).

Regarding claim 16, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 9 rejection) wherein said characteristic is one of (i) throughput, (ii) error rate, (iii) latency (i.e., the PLMN can be provided with fixed GPS receivers that each continuously keep track of the satellites visible from the receiver and pass information in messages to local mobile entities as to where to look for these satellites and estimated signal arrival times; this enables the mobile entities to substantially reduce acquisition time for the satellites and increase accuracy of measurement) (see col. 4, lines 46-52), and (iv) signal strength.

Regarding claim 17, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 9 rejection) wherein information of said location is based on Global Positioning System measurements (see fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 18, McDonnell discloses a method comprising: receiving information comprising a location (i.e., the user knowing their location thereby enabling them to transmit it to a location-aware service they are interested in receiving) (see col. 3, lines 23-25); determining that a characteristic of a first electromagnetic signal transmitted by a first wireless terminal exceeds a threshold (i.e., fig. 5 depicts the case of location determination being done in the mobile entity 20F by, for example, making Observed Time Difference (OTD) measurements with respect to signals from BTSs and calculating location using a knowledge of BTS locations. The location data is subsequently appended to a service request sent to service system in respect of a location-aware service) (see col. 5, lines 16-23); and transmitting to a second wireless terminal an indication that said second terminal should be able to communicate at said location with an access point such that said access point receives a second electromagnetic signal transmitted by said second wireless terminal with said characteristic exceeding said threshold (i.e., depicts the case of location determination being done in the network, for example, by making Timing Advance measurements for three BTSs and using these measurements to derive location (this derivation typically being done in a unit associated with BSC). The resultant location data is passed to a location serve from where it can be made available to authorised services. As for the mobile entity 20C in FIG. 3, when the mobile entity 20G of FIG. 5 wishes to invoke a location-aware service available on service system, it sends a request including an authorisation token and its ID (possible embedded in the token) to the service system 40; the

service system then uses the authorisation token to obtain the current location of the mobile entity 20G from the location server 67) (see col. 5, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 19, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 18 rejection) wherein said first wireless terminal and said second wireless terminal are different (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 20, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 18 rejection) wherein said first electromagnetic signal conveys a data block (i.e., the location determination is done by the infrastructure, it may be practical for systems covering only a limited number of users (such as the system illustrated in the left-hand half of FIG. 2 where a number of infrared beacons will cover a generally fairly limited) for location-data collection to be done whenever a mobile entity is newly detected by an IRB, this data being passed to location server where it is cached for use when needed) (see col.5, 44-51).

Regarding claim 21, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 18 rejection) wherein said access point performs measuring said characteristic (i.e., beyond current basic cell ID, it is possible to get a more accurate fix by measuring timing and/or directional parameters between the mobile entity and multiple BTSs, these measurement being done either in the network or the mobile entity) (see col. 5, lines 6-10).

Regarding claim 25, McDonnell discloses a method (see claim 18 rejection) wherein said characteristic is one of (i) throughput, (ii) error rate, (iii) latency (i.e., the PLMN can be provided with fixed GPS receivers that each continuously keep track of the satellites visible from the receiver and pass information in messages to local mobile entities as to where to look for these satellites and estimated signal arrival times; this enables the mobile entities to substantially

reduce acquisition time for the satellites and increase accuracy of measurement) (see col. 4, lines 46-52), and (iv) signal strength.

Regarding claim 26, McDonnell discloses an apparatus comprising: a processor for determining that a first wireless terminal at a location can communicate with a second wireless terminal with a level of service (i.e., the case of location determination being done in the mobile entity 20F by, for example, making Observed Time Difference (OTD) measurements with respect to signals from BTSs and calculating location using a knowledge of BTS locations. The location data is subsequently appended to a service request sent to service system in respect of a location-aware service) (see col. 5, lines 16-23); and a transmitter for transmitting to a third wireless terminal an indication that said third wireless terminal should be able to communicate with said second wireless terminal with said level of service at said location (i.e., depicts the case of location determination being done in the network, for example, by making Timing Advance measurements for three BTSs and using these measurements to derive location (this derivation typically being done in a unit associated with BSC). The resultant location data is passed to a location serve from where it can be made available to authorised services. As for the mobile entity 20C in FIG. 3, when the mobile entity 20G of FIG. 5 wishes to invoke a location-aware service available on service system, it sends a request including an authorisation token and its ID (possible embedded in the token) to the service system 40; the service system then uses the authorisation token to obtain the current location of the mobile entity 20G from the location server 67) (see col. 5, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 27, McDonnell discloses an apparatus (see claim 26 rejection) wherein said first wireless terminal and said third wireless terminal are different (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 30, McDonnell discloses an apparatus (see claim 26 rejection) wherein said level of service is in terms of latency (i.e., the PLMN can be provided with fixed GPS receivers that each continuously keep track of the satellites visible from the receiver and pass information in messages to local mobile entities as to where to look for these satellites and estimated signal arrival times; this enables the mobile entities to substantially reduce acquisition time for the satellites and increase accuracy of measurement) (see col. 4, lines 46-52).

Regarding claim 32, McDonnell discloses an apparatus comprising: a receiver for receiving from a first wireless terminal a measurement of a characteristic of an electromagnetic signal radiated by a source, wherein said measurement is associated with a location (i.e., fig. 5 depicts the case of location determination being done in the mobile entity 20F by, for example, making Observed Time Difference (OTD) measurements with respect to signals from BTSs and calculating location using a knowledge of BTS locations. The location data is subsequently appended to a service request sent to service system in respect of a location-aware service) (see col. 5, lines 16-23); and a transmitter for transmitting to a second wireless terminal an indication that said second wireless terminal should be able to receive at said location said electromagnetic signal with said measurement exceeding a threshold (i.e., depicts the case of location determination being done in the network, for example, by making Timing Advance measurements for three BTSs and using these measurements to derive location (this derivation typically being done in a unit associated with BSC). The resultant location data is passed to a location serve from where it can be made available to authorised services. As for the mobile entity 20C in FIG. 3, when the mobile entity 20G of FIG. 5 wishes to invoke a location-aware service available on service system, it sends a request including an authorisation token and its ID

(possible embedded in the token) to the service system 40; the service system then uses the authorisation token to obtain the current location of the mobile entity 20G from the location server 67) (see col. 5, lines 26-40).

Regarding claim 33, McDonnell discloses an apparatus (see claim 32 rejection) wherein said first wireless terminal and said second wireless terminal are different (see fig. 5).

Regarding claim 34, McDonnell discloses an apparatus (see claim 32 rejection) wherein said electromagnetic signal conveys a data block (i.e., the location determination is done by the infrastructure, it may be practical for systems covering only a limited number of users (such as the system illustrated in the left-hand half of FIG. 2 where a number of infrared beacons will cover a generally fairly limited) for location-data collection to be done whenever a mobile entity is newly detected by an IRB, this data being passed to location server where it is cached for use when needed) (see col.5, 44-51).

Regarding claim 39, McDonnell discloses an apparatus (see claim 32 rejection) wherein said characteristic is one of (i) throughput, (ii) error rate, (iii) latency (i.e., the PLMN can be provided with fixed GPS receivers that each continuously keep track of the satellites visible from the receiver and pass information in messages to local mobile entities as to where to look for these satellites and estimated signal arrival times; this enables the mobile entities to substantially reduce acquisition time for the satellites and increase accuracy of measurement) (see col. 4, lines 46-52), and (iv) signal strength.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-5, 13-15, 22-24, 28-29, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonnell in view of Cisneros et al. (Cisneros), U.S. Patent No. 5774829.

Regarding claim 3, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 1 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method further comprising displaying the indication.

However, Cisneros discloses a method comprising displaying the indication (i.e., the user's position will be displayed as a position) (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 4, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 3 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method wherein displaying said indication occurs in the form of a graphical map, wherein said graphical map portrays said location.

However, Cisneros discloses a method comprising a mobile unit, which includes a display wherein the user's position is displayed as a position on a map (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to give to the user the further ability to zoom the displayed map in and out so as to be able to get different perspectives on the user's location (see col. 9, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 5, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 4 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method wherein said third wireless terminal performs displaying said indication.

However, Cisneros discloses a method wherein a wireless terminal performs displaying an indication as related to location information (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claims 13, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 9 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method wherein said indication constitutes a set of displayable information, wherein said set of displayable information comprises said location.

However, Cisneros discloses a method comprising displaying the indication comprising location information (i.e., the user's position will be displayed as a position) (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 14, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 13 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method further comprising displaying at said second wireless terminal said set of displayable information.

However, Cisneros discloses a method wherein a wireless terminal performs displaying an indication as related to location information (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 15, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 13 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose a method wherein said set of displayable information is in the form of a graphical map, wherein the size of said set of displayable information is dependent on said second wireless terminal.

However, Cisneros discloses a method comprising a mobile unit, which includes a display wherein the user's position is displayed as a position on a map (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to give to the user the further ability to zoom the displayed map in and out so as to be able to get different perspectives on the user's location (see col. 9, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 22, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 18 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not specifically disclose a method wherein said indication constitutes a set of displayable information, wherein said set of displayable information comprises said location.

However, Cisneros discloses a method wherein a wireless terminal performs displaying an indication as related to location information (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a

display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 23, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 22 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not specifically disclose a method further comprising displaying at said second wireless terminal said set of displayable information.

However, Cisneros discloses a method wherein a wireless terminal performs displaying an indication as related to location information (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 24, Regarding claim 23, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 22 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not specifically disclose a method wherein said displayable information is in the form of a graphical map, wherein the size of said set of displayable information is dependent on said second wireless terminal.

However, Cisneros discloses a method comprising a mobile unit, which includes a display wherein the user's position is displayed as a position on a map (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to give to the user the further ability to zoom the displayed map in and out so as to be able to get different perspectives on the user's location (see col. 9, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 28, McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described above (see claim 26 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose an apparatus further comprising displaying the indication.

However, Cisneros discloses an apparatus comprising displaying the indication (i.e., the user's position will be displayed as a position) (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention to provide to the user a display indication of its location information, which can be updated periodically (see col. 9, lines 28-29).

Regarding claim 29, McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described above (see claim 28 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described, McDonnell does not to specifically disclose an apparatus wherein displaying said indication occurs in the form of a graphical map, wherein said graphical map portrays said location.

However, Cisneros discloses an apparatus comprising a mobile unit, which includes a display wherein the user's position is displayed as a position on a map (see col. 9, lines 22-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine both teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to give to the user the further ability to zoom the displayed map in and out so as to be able to get different perspectives on the user's location (see col. 9, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 36, refer to claim 13 reasoning.

Regarding claim 37, refer to claim 14 reasoning.

Regarding claim 38, refer to claim 15 reasoning.

7. Claims 8, 12, 31, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonnell in view of Knauerhase et al. (Knauerhase), Pub. No. US 20040203847.

Regarding claim 8, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 1 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method as described, McDonnell does not specifically disclose a method wherein said second wireless terminal is an IEEE 802.11 access point.

However, Knauerhase discloses a location based task notification comprising of IEEE 802.11 access point (see page 2, paragraph 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as disclosed to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide system security based on an open system authentication or a shared key authentication.

Regarding claim 12, McDonnell discloses a method as described above (see claim 11 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses a method wherein the data block constitutes a beacon frame (see col.5, 44-51), McDonnell does not specifically disclose a method wherein said source is an IEEE 802.11 access point.

However, Knauerhase discloses a location based task notification comprising of IEEE 802.11 access point (see page 2, paragraph 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as disclosed to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide system security based on an open system authentication or a shared key authentication.

Regarding claim 31, McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described above (see claim 26 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described, McDonnell does not specifically disclose an apparatus wherein said second wireless terminal is an IEEE 802.11 access point.

However, Knauerhase discloses a location based task notification comprising of IEEE 802.11 access point (see page 2, paragraph 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as disclosed to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide system security based on an open system authentication or a shared key authentication.

Regarding claim 35, McDonnell discloses an apparatus as described above (see claim 34 rejection).

Although McDonnell discloses an apparatus wherein the data block constitutes a beacon frame (see col.5, 44-51), McDonnell does not specifically disclose an apparatus wherein said source is an IEEE 802.11 access point.

However, Knauerhase discloses a location based task notification comprising of IEEE 802.11 access point (see page 2, paragraph 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings as disclosed to arrive at the claimed invention. A motivation for doing so would have been to provide system security based on an open system authentication or a shared key authentication.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Louis Desir whose telephone number is 703-605-4312. The examiner can normally be reached on (571) 272-7799.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pierre-Louis Desir
AU 2681
06/27/2005

JEAN GELIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER